

## **Appendix A—Reports Previously Published Reports on California’s Correctional Crisis**

### **Summary of Previous Reports**

We agree with the Little Hoover Commission (2007) in that California doesn’t need another report outlining correctional reform measures. What California needs to do is implement some of the proposals that have already been presented to it. Since 1990, there have been more than a dozen reports published that deal with the crisis in California’s adult prison system. The major recommendations made in all of these reports are entirely consistent with the recommendations contained in our report. In fact, a review of these 15 reports by Panel co-chair Joan Petersilia revealed that all of the reports recommend essentially the same ten things, which are:

1. Stop sending non-violent, non-serious offenders to prison. This particularly pertains to technical parole violators, who could better be served in community based, intermediate facilities.
2. Once in prison, use a standardized risk and needs assessment tool to match resources with needs and determinate appropriate placements for evidence-based rehabilitation programs.
3. Develop and implement more and better work, education, and substance abuse treatment programs for prisoners and parolees.
4. Reform California’s determinate sentencing system to reward prisoners for participating in rehabilitation programs and allow the system to retain prisoners who represent a continued public safety risk.
5. Move low risk prisoners to community-based facilities toward the later part of their sentences to foster successful reintegration and save more expensive prison-based resources. Sub-populations, such as women, the elderly and the sick, are ideal candidates.
6. Create a sentencing policy commission or some other administrative body that is authorized to design new sentencing statutes into a workable system that balances uniformity of sentencing with flexibility of individualization.
7. Reform California’s parole system so that non-serious parole violators are handled in community based intermediate facilities and more violent parole violators are prosecuted for new crimes.
8. Create viable partnerships between state and local corrections agencies that would expand sentencing options, enhance rehabilitation services, and strengthen local reentry systems. Suggestions have been made that include Community Corrections Acts (to get greater funding for local criminal justice initiatives) and a Community Corrections Division of the CDCR charged with developing alternatives.
9. Evaluate all programs and require that existing and newly funded programs are based on solid research evidence.
10. Promote public awareness so that taxpayers know what they are getting for their public safety investment and become smarter and more engaged about California’s prison system.

## List of Previous Reports

*Blue Ribbon Commission on Inmate Population Management (1990)* established by the California legislature in 1987, chaired by Grover Trask (District Attorney Riverside County). It issued its final report in 1990 with 38 recommendations. Recommended alternative sanctions, and more programming, reentry programs.

*Prison Population and Criminal Justice Policy in California (1992)*. California Policy Seminar. Frank Zimring and Gordon Hawkins. Analysis of the recent expansion of California prisons and alternative policy responses.

*Crime and Punishment in California: Full Cells, Empty Pockets, and Questionable Benefits (1993)*. California Policy Research Center, Joan Petersilia describes the growing problem of parole violators in California prisons.

*Putting Violence Behind Bars: Redefining the Role of California's Prisons (1994)*. The Little Hoover Commission found that the State's sentencing system was unduly complicated and inequitable to both victims and offenders and there was little distinction between the way violent and non-violent criminals were handled. The Commission recommended that the State create a sentencing commission to develop a sentencing structure that protects public safety, tailors the punishment to fit the crime, addresses the needs of victims, fosters responsibility in prisoners and balances costs with benefits.

*Estimating the Effect of Increased Incarceration on Crime in California (1995)*. California Policy Research Center, Franklin Zimring and his authors describe the impact of increased prison populations on crime rates in California.

*Minimizing Harm as a Goal for Crime Policy in California (1997)*. California Policy Seminar Report. Edited by Edward Rubin, with analysis and chapters by Zimring, Greenwood, Petersilia, Skolnick, and others. Purpose was to draw on the work of leading criminologists to consider ways to address the critical problems facing California criminal justice system.

*Beyond Bars: Correctional Reforms to Lower Prison Costs and Reduce Crime (1998)*. The Little Hoover Commission found that state and local correctional systems were not integrated and that the State's response to offenders needed to include an expansion of local sanctions and community correctional facilities for low-level offenders. The Commission also recommended expanding programs for prisoners and parolees, developing separate facilities for parolees returned to custody who are most likely to re-offend and re-evaluating the organizational structure of parole.

*Challenges of Prisoner Reentry and Parole in California (2000)*. Joan Petersilia, California Policy Research Center. Describes the unique challenges of California's prisoner reentry problem.

*Back to the Community: Safe and Sound Parole Policies (2003)*. Little Hoover Commission found that the State's parole policies resulted in far too many parolees returning to overcrowded prison facilities for technical violations. The Commission proposed expanding evidence-based rehabilitative programs for prisoners and parolees and recommended policy-makers review the sentencing laws that place every offender on parole following incarceration.

*Breaking the Barriers for Women on Parole (2004)*. The Little Hoover Commission studied the unique barriers facing the more than 10,000 women in California's prisons and 12,000 women on parole.

## APPENDIX A—REPORTS PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED REPORTS ON CALIFORNIA’S CORRECTIONAL CRISIS

*Governor’s Plan to Reorganize the Youth and Adult Correctional Agency* (2005). Corrections Independent Review Panel: Reforming California’s Youth and Adult Correctional System (“The Deukmejian Report”). The Commission reviewed Governor Schwarzenegger’s plan to reorganize the Youth and Adult Correctional Agency into the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. This reorganization, which the Commission supported, placed a renewed emphasis on rehabilitation for prisoners and parolees.

*Understanding California Corrections*, California Policy Research Center (2006). Joan Petersilia wrote a primer on the California corrections system, from arrest through release on parole and return. She recommended greater emphasis on in-prison and parole planning, presumptive sentencing or a sentencing commission, and a return to indeterminate sentencing.

*Task Force on California Prison Crowding*, National Council on Crime and Delinquency (2006). This report offers policy and program options to address the severe problems in California prisons.

*Reducing the Incarceration of Women: Community Based Alternatives*, National Council on Crime and Delinquency (2006). This report describes effective treatment for women in prison in California.

*Solving California’s Corrections Crisis: Time is Running Out* (2007). The Little Hoover Commission studied the correctional crisis facing California from a financial expenditure perspective.

